

Program Management Oversight

RFP HSR06-0010

Response to Questions

Q1. Request for a copy of the RFP Holders List.

A1. See the attached list. This list is compiled from those firms downloading from the California State Contract Register and does not include firms who may have downloaded the RFP from the Authority website.

Q2. If a company is a subcontract on the PMO contract, can the Company participate as a Prime or Subcontractor on next years Bay Area segment PE/EIR procurement? If there is a conflict, can the Company avoid it by resigning from the PMO team?

A2. Seeing though the PMO will be providing oversight of the Program Management work the Authority has determined that the PMO contractor can not participate in any work that is being managed and directed by the Program Manager (Parsons Brinckerhoff). By resigning the Company can avoid the conflict however this would be very disruptive to the project.

Q3. Will the Authority accept as a Prime, a sole proprietor and Certified Small Business with resources provided by more substantial subcontractors?

A3. The Authority will base their evaluation of proposals based on the criteria established in the RFP.

Q4. Given the amount of work involved under the Project/Program Monitoring Technical Review and Programmatic Review as summarized on pages 4 and 5 of the Scope of Work section of the RFP, is the \$2,000,000 estimated contract amount for the full 6 year contract duration correct?

A4. At this time the \$2,000,000 estimated contract value is for the full six years, however this amount can be adjusted up or down based on the workload and need.

Q5. Can you provide a list of the consultant and sub consultant firms currently working on behalf of the CHSRA? I assume these firms would be precluded from proposing on the PMO Contract?

A5. See attached list. Those firms that are part of the PB team or are being managed and directed by PB would be excluded from proposing on the PMO contract.

Q6. What firms are conflicted out? Specifically, are subconsultants under current contract with the Authority (i.e. for the Preliminary Design & Project-Specific Environmental work), conflicted out of pursuing this contract?

A6. See the response to questions 2 & 5.

Q7. Is your RFP HSR06-0010 a follow on to HSR06-0001? If so can you please tell me who the incumbent Contractor is and who their teaming partners are?

A7. RFP HSR06-0010 is to provide oversight of Program Management Contract (RFQ HSR06-0001) and is not a follow on contract. Parsons Brinckerhoff is providing the Program Management Services for the Authority, attached is a list of all their teaming partners.

Q8. If the RFQ is not for a follow on contract, can you provide me with a Bidder's list so we can possible team with a qualified bidder?

A8. See response to question 1.

Q9. Is there a page limit for the proposal?

A9. No.

Q10. Can we get a copy of the PM's approved scope of work, so that we can assess what specific PMO functions are appropriate?

A10. The RFP provided the Scope of Work for the PM, please use that in preparing your proposal.

Q11. Are primes and subs who got corridor awards precluded from this solicitation?

A11. See response to questions 2 & 5

Q12. Would the winner of this solicitation be precluded from all future work (for example, CM for corridor construction)?

A12. These PMO services are for the Preliminary Engineering/Project-Level Environmental stage of the work. Once the Authority goes into construction the PMO services will require a substantial change in the scope of work and would in all likelihood be rebid.

Q13. As for extension to staff:

- do you anticipate having someone in your offices?
- If, so what percent of the time?
- Would you foresee this being the PM or a more jr. person for day-to-day assistance, the PM being in as needed?

A13. At this time we do not anticipate needing someone from the PMO team to be housed in our office, however as the project progresses we can evaluate the need.

Q14. Will the Authority be answering questions about the RFP as they are received, or is the Authority's plan to collect the vendor questions and answer them all after April 4?

A14. Yes and no. Prior to Addendum 1 the Authority was going to wait until the close of the comment period (April 4), now that the comment period has been extended it has been determined that those questions received by the April 4th date would be responded to as a group and any questions received through May 4th will be responded to as they are received.

Q15. Page 6, Paragraph V - The final sentence mentions a requirement for the CONTRACTOR/TEAM to train the Authority staff on the use of the financial model. Could you please expand on this requirement, in that we could find no other mention in the RFP of the financial model?

A15. That language was pulled from a previous RFP and should not be included. Please disregard that requirement.

Q16. Page 11, third paragraph – This paragraph mentions that the State will withhold 10% of each progress payment. At what intervals does the Authority propose to evaluate the Contractor/Team's performance and make a determination that all contract requirements have been satisfactorily fulfilled?

A16. It is a state contracting requirement to withhold 10% of each progress payments. The Authority will evaluate the contractor's performance based on completion of tasks, at which time the contractor can request the release of retention.

Q17. What is the current status of the project in terms of procuring the Project Management vendor?

A17. The Authority entered into an agreement with Parsons Brinckerhoff in November 2006 for the program management services.

Q18. Does the Authority have any internal oversight methodology or approach models to which the successful vendor will be expected to conform to?

A18. No.

Q19. Has the Authority identified a manufacturer for the high-speed cars and location of the manufacturing site? Will the PMO be involved in certification of the cars?

A19. The Authority has only determined that the trains will be steel-wheel on steel-rail and has not identified the manufacturer or the location of the manufacturing site. At this time the Authority does not see the PMO providing certification of the cars.

Q20. On page 7 of the RFP there is reference to "...the first work program...". Would you please explain the scope of work of the first work program?

A20. The first work program covers potentially the initial phase of work the PMO will perform (whether it is the first year or an increment of the year) based on the work being performed by the PM.

Q21. Recent large rail projects have been built as concession type contracts. Accordingly it seems desirable to have a review of this type of contracting approach as part of the Scope of Work and to have a PMO with that kind of expertise in a high speed rail context. Would you please consider including high speed rail concession contract experience and review in the RFP?

A21. The Authority is contracting for the PMO services in relation to the work being performed by the PM, if the PM is going to assist the Authority in the development of procurement packages the PMO would have the responsibility to provide oversight of the development of these packages.

Q22. Review of Submittals – Differentiation between the PM and the PMO Responsibilities:

In the first paragraph of section IV. Scope of Work, the following is stated: “the PMO must also have access to technical resources for the review of civil and systems deliverables to establish conformance with project goals.” In addition, in Part C of the same section, the following is stated:

“The PMO will also perform technical reviews of work methods and products. These reviews will be coordinated with critical milestones for engineering and design advancement for the HS project. These reviews will be coordinated with critical milestones for engineering and design advancement of the HST project. The goal is to assure that the pre-design phase of the project being performed by the PM is done at the highest level of care and utilizes the latest proven technology and methods. The PMO shall review the design criteria and preliminary designs with respect to some or all of the following in all key disciplines:

- efficiency of design directives and conceptual designs
- clarity and completeness of criteria and conceptual designs”

Meanwhile, in Attachment A Program Management Services, Scope of Work & Services, the responsibility of the PM is states to include Quality Management (part F) and the following: “The majority of the preliminary design work will be accomplished through the regional environmental/engineering contracts however the PM maybe required to perform additional design work or full design on specific elements.”

Please clarify the differentiation between the roles and responsibilities of the PMO and the PM with respect to design oversight and the reviews of design submissions. Specifically:

- a. Is the PMO responsible for conducting full design reviews of all project components that are designed by the PM? If so, will a listing of which project components that are to be designed the PM be provided in a timely manner to properly address this aspect of the PMO proposal?

- b. Is the PM responsible for conducting full design reviews of all design submittals produced by others under its coordination and management? If so, is the PMO responsible for providing overall assessments of the design reviews conducted the PM. If not, the PMO responsible for conducting full design reviews of all design submittals produced by entities other than the PM, but are under the PM's coordination and management?

A22. In response to Part A of 22 – The language contained in the PM RFQ “the PM maybe required to perform additional design work or full design on specific elements” was included to ensure that if there were certain portions of the HST system that needed further design due to circumstances outside the Authority's control (such as a grade separation initiated by another entity) that the Authority had the ability and resources to ensure the design was done to accommodate the HST. A list of these project components does not exist and would be addressed as they are proposed. At this time the Authority would expect the PMO to provide an appropriate level of oversight and review of the designs produced by the PM.

In response to Part B of 22 – The PM is responsible for the conducting full design reviews of all design submittals produced by others under its coordination and management. The PMO will provide the appropriate level of oversight of the design review conducted by the PM.

Q23. Are we to understand that any attempt to discuss the RFP with you by telephone will result in disqualification? Have there been any discussions with individuals of firms regarding this RFP prior to its release?

A23. The Authority's policy is to restrict discussions specific to this RFP, however general questions can be asked either by phone, fax or email. There have been no discussions with individuals of firms regarding the specifics of this RFP prior its release.